

—uriseptin—but it is said to contain “Lithium Comp. with amido-formaldehyd”. On inquiry we are advised that this is quite as meaningless to the chemist and pharmacist as was the imaginary chemical first given as entering into the composition of the “remedy” (Heaven save the mark—a remedy!) in question. We are assured by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the A. M. A. that a verified formula is filed with the copy for each and every advertisement of a proprietary mixture. If that is the case it is certainly imperative that the Trustees discharge the person who “verified” the formulas which this concern is filing with the Association. It is ludicrous, or would be if it were not so pitifully undignified, to see the great American Medical Association so carried away with “frenzied finance” that it must needs sell the Association’s birthright for a mess of pottage!

The California State Nurses Association has had prepared a bill which is to be introduced in the legislature, providing for **REGISTRATION OF NURSES.** registration of graduate and qualified nurses. The text of the bill has been submitted to a number of attorneys and prominent physicians and has received their approval. At the December meeting of the San Francisco County Medical Society the matter was presented and a resolution passed endorsing the proposed law. This certainly seems to be an excellent and progressive measure. At the last meeting of the British Association similar action was taken and a resolution prevailed recommending to Parliament that the Nurses Registration Act be passed. Any measure that tends to elevate or improve the standards of any profession should receive the approval and the endorsement of those in other professions, for what aids one, aids the others. The JOURNAL is very glad to note this action and certainly wishes the nurses every success in their efforts.

The general condition of harmony in the medical profession on the subject of “hands off” the medical law, is very encouraging. **DANGER FROM OUR FRIENDS** It looks, at the present writing, as though enemies of the law as it is, will have a well nigh impossible task if they undertake to amend it to its detriment. But there is one danger that must be recognized and guarded against—“improvements” that may be suggested by gentlemen who may be undoubtedly honest in their mistaken motives. We are advised that a letter has been written to a member of the Board of Examiners asking the endorsement of the board on a proposed amendment to the law, striking out the words “in discharge of his professional duties,” referring to medical officers of the Army and Navy and Marine Hospital Services. At present these gentlemen cannot legally practice outside of their official work unless they comply with the laws of

the State in which they are located. The matter was called to the attention of the Surgeon General who advised the board that medical officers were so instructed, and that the matter would naturally come before the local courts. There are very many reasons why this amendment should not be even suggested, let alone enacted. In the first place it would endanger the constitutionality of the whole act, for it would be special legislation. It would allow these very estimable officers to seriously effect the practices of men who have complied with the law. If these medical officers are desirous of practicing in California, and if they are competent, let them take the examination before the Board of Examiners and get a license just the same as anybody else. This is the most vicious proposed amendment that has come to our attention; kill it promptly and bury it deep.

“MY SON, MAKE MONEY; HONESTLY, IF YOU CAN, BUT—MAKE MONEY.”

Let us once more glance at the financial statement made by the Trustees of the A. M. A. at the last meeting and see whether further understanding may have come from reflection. In August the STATE JOURNAL criticised the financial statement; we disagreed with the Trustees in crediting the profit of the Association (some \$38,000) to the *Journal*, and asserted that this profit should properly be credited to members’ dues and was the remainder after paying from the dues collected the expenses of the Association and some \$14,000 to the *Journal* account. We also called the attention of the Trustees to the fact that the Association *Journal* was not being conducted in a very ethical manner, and that it openly violated those ethical principles which have been promulgated by the Association for the guidance of physicians.

To these words of criticism the Chairman of the Board of Trustees took exception. His letter in reply to them was printed in the November *Journal*, and after reading carefully his letter, it would seem that Dr. Happel has clearly demonstrated the truth of our original contention. For the time being the portion of the correspondence relating to the quality of advertising in the A. M. A. *Journal* will not be discussed, except to say that up to the present time the Trustees have not published a statement, as we requested, setting forth when and where the formulas we mentioned were published in the pages of the *Journal*.

On page 329 of the November *Journal* Dr. Happei says:

“I am surprised that you will attempt to make your readers believe that the “dues” is no part of the *Journal* income. You do not appear to be aware of the fact that the \$63,237.48 entered as membership dues is the amount paid by members of the association as subscribers to the *Journal*, receiving the *Journal* by virtue of paying their membership fees of \$5.00 each year and that for 1903 the above amount of \$63,237.48 was collected.”

While the above quotation is a little confused, Dr. Happel appears to be trying to make the dues appear as subscriptions to the *Journal*. If this were true, all subscribers might claim membership, for they could claim that membership cost nothing and was a sort of premium attached to subscription. As a matter of fact, the reverse is the case; membership costs \$5 a year, and the *Journal* is sent as a part of the benefit attaching to such membership. Quite naturally a portion of the membership fee should be paid over to the *Journal* to cover the cost of sending the publication to each member; let us see what this amount is: The report states that \$63,237.48 was received from members’ dues, less collections. It also states that the Association expenses, aside from publication expenses, amounted to approximately \$11,000, which amount is properly chargeable to the